

In the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska

R.G. (Father),

Petitioner,

v.

**State of Alaska, DHSS, OCS, P.G.
(Mother), A.G. (Child) , E.G (Child) ,
S.G. (Child) , Y.G. (Child), and Office
of Public Advocacy,**

Respondents.

Supreme Court No. **S-18075**

Order

Petition for Review

Date of Order: **May 28, 2021**

Trial Court Case Nos. **3PA-20-00151/152/153/154CN**

Before: Bolger, Chief Justice, Winfree, Maassen, Carney, and
Borghesan, Justices.

R.G. (Father) has lodged a petition for review of the superior court's March 9, 2021 order finding probable cause to believe R.G.'s children are in need of aid under AS 47.10.011(6) and (8) and committing the children to OCS's temporary custody. R.G. also has filed a number of motions collateral to the petition for review, which have been held for disposition pending determination whether the petition for review should proceed. Responses to the petition for review have not been filed. This matter has been referred to the full court for disposition.

A petition for review is a procedure for a party to seek appellate review of a trial court order while the trial court still has jurisdiction over the relevant proceedings, instead of waiting to file an appeal after the trial court's final judgment. There may be unusual and compelling circumstances that would cause this court to intervene and take up a petition for review even though likely delaying the trial court proceedings. The appellate rules provide a framework for deciding whether to grant a petition for review,

R.G. (Father) v. State, DHSS, OCS, et al.
Supreme Court No. S-18075
Order of May 28, 2021
Page 2

and review is entirely discretionary on this court's part. In other words, a party has no automatic or absolute right to appellate review under the petition for review framework.

We have considered the substance of R.G.'s petition for review and his related motions. We conclude that this provides sufficient information to decide whether to grant review of the March 9 order, and we do not need to see responses from the other parties about the merits of R.G.'s petition for review. Based on R.G.'s petition for review and the related motions, the petition for review is **DENIED**, and all pending motions are **DENIED** as moot.

Entered at the direction of the court.

Clerk of the Appellate Courts



Ryan Montgomery-Sythe,
Chief Deputy Clerk

cc: Supreme Court Justices
Judge Kristiansen
Trial Court Clerk - Palmer

Distribution:

Email:
R.G. (Father)
Mackin, Olivia L., Office of Public Advocacy
Ranchoff, Eric J
Demarest, Katherine
Bennett, Laurel Carter, Public Defender
Beecher, Linda R., Public Defender
Levitt, Rachel E., Office of Public Advocacy
Stinson, James E.